

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 26 has been amended as shown on page 5 of the Reply. A current listing of the claims is shown at pp. 2-5 of the Reply.

An interview was conducted on October 31, 2007. The main focus of the interview was on deficiencies of the 102 rejection. While the presented matter generally related to all the claims, the crux was upon Claims 1 and 22-26. In particular, reference U.S. Publication No. 2004/0073511 by Beaumont et al. was discussed in the interview. Ideas related to amendments disclosed herein were presented to the Examiner. The interview was conducted with Ronald Krosky (Reg. No. 58,564), Pavan Keshavareddy, and Examiner Kendall. The Examiner is thanked for courtesies extended and no agreements were reached

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Beaumont *et al.* (2004/0073511). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Beaumont *et al.* does not disclose each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “*each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.*” In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Applicants’ claimed invention relates generally to modeling of complex business rule(s) in a computer system. In particular, the present invention relates to a system and method for tree-based rule composition with natural language inline editing. For example, the system can combine a familiar hierarchical structure, such as a computer tree, and inline editing of natural language based logical expression(s) to provide a general purpose logical expression builder. In particular, independent claim 1, in part, recites a system facilitating rule composition comprising: *a rule composer that in response to a user input facilitates at least one of creation and*

modification of a rule, the rule composer further receiving information associated with the at least one of creation and modification of the rule based, at least in part, upon natural language inline editing. Beaumont *et al.* fails to disclose or anticipate such novel aspects of the claimed invention.

Beaumont *et al.* merely relates to systems and methods that permit credit card processing organizations to use rule-based systems to design and administer credit card programs. Accordingly, Beaumont *et al.* discloses a method of providing bankcard services that includes receiving at a host computer system a selection of a business rule from a library of business rules. The business rules may include information defining an event, a condition relating to at least one element associated with bankcard accounts, and information defining an action to be taken based on the condition upon the occurrence of the event.

In the subject Office Action, the Examiner argues that Beaumont *et al.* discloses *a rule composer ...creation and modification of a rule, the rule composer further receiving information... of creation and modification of the rule based, at least in part, upon natural language inline editing* at paragraph 0083. Applicants' representative would like to direct the Examiner's attention to the reference and highlight that there is no paragraph 0083 disclosed in the reference. Beaumont *et al.* contains a maximum of 64 paragraphs. Therefore, the Examiner is incorrectly rejecting the claims based on a *non-existent paragraph*. Similarly, the Examiner rejects claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, and 29 by referring to paragraphs which are *non-existent and not disclosed* in Beaumont *et al.* Therefore, the Examiner fails to particularly point out the claimed subject matter in view of the reference, and this is an improper rejection. Accordingly, the rejection is respectfully withdrawn.

Moreover, assuming that the Examiner incorrectly points to particular paragraphs of the reference and Beaumont *et al.* is used as a prior art to anticipate the claimed subject matter, Beaumont *et al.* in its entirety fails to disclose or anticipate each and every element of the claimed subject matter. In particular, Beaumont *et al.* is silent with respect to *creation and modification of the rule based, at least in part, upon natural language inline editing*, as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly in independent claims 22, 23, 24, and 25.) The inline editing of natural language based logical expression(s) of the claimed invention can be combined with hierarchical tree structures to provide general purpose logical expression builder. Beaumont *et al.* fails to disclose or anticipate any such natural language inline editing.

Beaumont *et al.* merely discloses that clients can select pre- designed business rules, modify rules in the library, or create their own rules. However, Beaumont *et al.* is silent with respect to inline editing of ***natural language based language expressions***.

Independent claim 26 recites *a user interface facilitating natural language inline editing for rule composition comprising: a policy explorer region that displays hierarchical information associated with a policy, the policy comprising at least one rule; and a rule editor region that display hierarchical information associate with the rule, the rule modified and/or created based, at least in part, upon natural language inline editing.* Firstly, as mentioned *supra*, the Examiner uses paragraphs which are not disclosed in the reference to reject the subject claims. Secondly, independent claim 26, as amended, in part recites *the rule modified and/or created based, at least in part, upon natural language inline editing.* As discussed *supra*, Beaumont *et al.* fails to disclose or anticipate any such natural language inline editing.

Based on at least the foregoing, Beaumont *et al.* fails to anticipate each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 (and claims which depend there from). Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP483US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731